		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		10/068,261	DICKENS, JAMES EDWARD
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Eric V Woods	2672	

All Participants:

(1) *Eric V Woods*.

(2) *Michael Lukon (48,164)*.

Status of Application: *Pending*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *17 May 2005*

Time: *8:30 am EST*

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☐ No
   If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
8, 15, 21

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner had concerns about the exact wording of the language, because the specification clearly set forth that the registration marks were present so that the once the scanner had the image of the scanned form, it could orient it in the correct manner and extract the chracters, and the claims as written would cover situations where the marks were only present so tha the user would know how to properly orient the paper for the scanner. Examiner proposed certain changes to applicant's representative to correct the potential indefiniteness issues. .